

REMARKS

This is in response to an Office Action mailed September 6, 2005, in which claims 1-20 were pending. With this response, claims 10 and 20 are amended. In light of these amendments and in view of the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all objections and rejections and request allowance of the application.

1. Responsive to the rejection of claims 10 and 20 at page 2 of the Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 10 and 20 to correspond to the Examiner's suggestion. With this amendment, the rejection of claims 10 and 20 is overcome, and should be withdrawn.

2. Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-20 under §103(a) over the combination of Gatz and West at pages 2-7 of the Office Action.

The Office Action acknowledges that "Gatz does not explicitly teach receiving a profile, created by the parent or guardian" (*See Office Action*, p. 3) and that Gatz does not explicitly teach "communicating information from the profile to the client device ..." (*See Office Action*, p. 4). The Office Action asserts:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Gatz as taught by West to modify instant messaging to provide parental control to make the parents feel comfortable that their children are doing activities other than instant messaging.

Office Action, pp. 4-5.

Applicants respectfully disagree that the combination of Gatz with West would have been obvious. First, Applicants note that Gatz is directed to an access server for controlling use of services in an account based access server for parental control of child and family accounts. *See Gatz*, Abstract. West is directed to a viewer discretion television program control system for storing suitability ratings for each program receivable by a television set. *See West*, Abstract. There is no motivation to combine parental control of television programs of West with the

parental management of computer accounts in the account-based access server of Gatz. Neither reference suggests such a combination.

Moreover, Gatz discloses server-based access controls. *See Gatz*, p. 2, paragraph 0015. West discloses a home censorship device for controlling access to television programs. *See West* Col. 4, line 58-Col. 5, line 19. The server-based access control of Gatz is inconsistent with the home censorship device of West. Neither reference discloses or suggests a motivation for overcoming these inconsistent teachings. Thus, the combination of Gatz and West is not supported by their disclosures. The only motivation to make the asserted combination is provided by the current application. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-20 over the combination of Gatz and West is improper and should be withdrawn.

Finally, even if the asserted combination is made, the combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11. Neither Gatz nor West disclose or suggest communicating information from the profile to the client device to modify the functionality of the client device to comply with at least one policy in the profile, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, neither reference discloses a second server to communicate information from the profile to the client device to modify the functionality of the client device to comply with at least one policy in the profile, as recited in claim 11.

Instead, Gatz discloses that the access server controls use of services. *See Gatz*, p. 2, paragraph 0015. Gatz discloses that the access server includes logic for verifying parental status of a parent account with respect to a child account and logic for limiting access to a user. *See Gatz*, p. 2, paragraph 0015. Thus, Gatz teaches controlling access via logic provided at the access server and fails to disclose or suggest communicating information from the profile to the client device to modify the functionality of the client device to comply with at least one policy in the profile, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

In contrast to claims 1 and 11, West discloses a home censorship device at each home, which receives television program rating information at regular intervals. *See West*, Col. 4, line 58-Col. 5, line 19. Utilizing a personal identification number (PIN) for each member of the household, a keypad and a non-volatile memory are used to establish time of day, duration, and content constraints for television viewing behaviors. *See West*, Col. 5, lines 8-14. West fails to disclose or suggest communicating information from the profile to the client device to modify

the functionality of the client device to comply with at least one policy in the profile, as recited in claims 1 and 11.

The asserted combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest receiving a profile created by the parent or guardian, as recited in claims 1 and 11. Additionally, the asserted combination fails to disclose or suggest communicating information from the profile to the client device to modify the functionality of the client device to comply with at least one policy in the profile, as recited in claims 1 and 11. The asserted combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest each of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11. Claims 2-10 and 12-20 depend from allowable claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the asserted combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 2-10 and 12-20, at least by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 11.

Moreover, the asserted combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest using a policy engine of the client device to limit usage of the IM service to the minor based on the at least one policy (claim 2), wherein the policy engine comprises a plug-in for an instant messaging client (claims 3, 4, 13, 15, and 17). Additionally, Gatz and West fail to disclose at least one policy that indicates specific times when messages from members of a buddy list for the minor are to be blocked or allowed (claim 9 and 19).

With regard to claim 12, the combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest a client device comprising a policy engine to limit usage of the IM service to the minor based on the at least one policy.

Therefore, the combination of Gatz and West fails to disclose or suggest each of the elements of claims 1-20.

CONCLUSION


Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the claims now pending.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

10-11-2005
Date


Jeffrey G. Toler; Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.
5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265
Austin, Texas 78746
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5452 (fax)